

**PROPERTIES EQUIVALENT TO THE  
COMPLETENESS OF  $\{e^{-t\lambda_n}\}$**

R. P. BOAS, JR., AND HARRY POLLARD

We are concerned with the following three properties which may be possessed by an increasing sequence  $\{\lambda_n\}$  of positive integers.

(A) If  $\{a_n\}$  is a sequence of complex numbers such that, for some  $\beta$ ,  $a_n = O(n^\beta)$  and  $\Delta^{\lambda_n} a_0 = 0$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ),  $a_n$  is a polynomial in  $n$ ; here

$$\Delta^n a_0 = \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k C_{n,k} a_k.$$

(B) The set  $\{t^{\lambda_n} e^{-\sigma t}\}$  is complete  $L^2(0, \infty)$ ; that is,

$$\int_0^\infty t^{\lambda_n} e^{-\sigma t} \phi(t) dt = 0 \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots; \phi \in L^2)$$

implies  $\phi(t) = 0$  almost everywhere.<sup>1</sup>

(C) If  $f(z)$  is regular and  $O(|z|^\alpha)$  for some  $\alpha$  in the half-plane  $x > -\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ , and  $f^{(\lambda_n)}(0) = 0$  ( $n = 1, 2, \dots$ ),  $f(z)$  is a polynomial.<sup>2</sup>

W. H. J. Fuchs [3]<sup>3</sup> showed that (A) and (B) are equivalent. We shall give a somewhat simpler proof, and show in addition that (C) is equivalent to (A) and (B).

Fuchs showed that (A) is true if  $n(r) \geq r/2 - \gamma$  for some constant  $\gamma$ , where  $n(r)$  is the number of  $\lambda_n \leq r$ . R. P. Agnew discovered independently [1] that (A) is true if  $\lambda_n = 2n$ ; a simplified proof given by Pollard [5] was the starting point of this note. Boas [2] has shown by other methods that it is enough to have  $n(r) \geq r/2 - r\delta(r)$ , where  $\int^\infty r^{-1} \delta(r) dr$  converges and  $\delta(r)$  satisfies some mild auxiliary conditions. (Fuchs, in a paper [3a] which appeared while this note was in the press, has shown that a necessary and sufficient condition for (A) is that  $\int^\infty r^{-2} \psi(r) dr$  diverges, where  $\log \psi(r) = 2 \sum_{\lambda_n \leq r} \lambda_n^{-1}$ .)

Let  $\mathcal{P}(\lambda_n)$  mean that  $\{\lambda_n\}$  has property (P);  $\mathcal{P}(\lambda_n - N)$ , that the sequence  $\{\lambda_n - N\}$  has (P), where  $\lambda_n - N$  is replaced by 0 if  $\lambda_n < N$ . Our line of reasoning is schematically as follows:  $\mathcal{A}(\lambda_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n + N) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\lambda_n + N) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\lambda_n - N) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda_n - N) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\lambda_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(\lambda_n)$ . It would be more direct to use  $\mathcal{B}(\lambda_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda_n - N)$ ; this can be quoted from the

Received by the editors December 17, 1945.

<sup>1</sup> Replacing  $ct$  by  $t$ , we see that (B) is independent of  $c$ .

<sup>2</sup> (C) thus concerns the analytic continuation of a function defined by a lacunary power series  $\sum c_n z^{\lambda_n}$ , where  $\{\mu_n\}$  is the sequence of positive integers complementary to  $\{\lambda_n\}$ .

<sup>3</sup> Numbers in brackets refer to the references at the end of the paper.